



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/810,342

03/26/2004

Raymond H. Bryden

1035-R4303

8212

34456 7590 06/28/2007

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE
SUITE 200
AUSTIN, TX 78730

EXAMINER

O HERN, BRENT T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1772

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/28/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/810,342</p>	<p>Applicant(s) BRYDEN, RAYMOND H.</p>	
	<p>Examiner Brent T. O'Hern</p>	<p>Art Unit 1772</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): all 35 USC 112 rejections.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____
Claim(s) objected to: _____
Claim(s) rejected: 40-48, 50, 57-63, 65, 66 and 70.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____

Brent T. O'Hern
6-25-2007

Nasser Ahmad
NASSER AHMAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER 6/26/07

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The Amendment filed 18 June 2007 will not be entered.

The amendment overcomes the previous 35 USC 112 rejections, however, said amendment presents new 35 USC 112 issues.

Said amendment does not place the application in better condition for appeal since new 35 USC 112 issues are introduced by said amendment.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The amendment filed 18 June 2007 overcomes the previous 35 USC 112 rejections, however, said amendment introduces new 35 USC 112 issues to dependent claims 65 and 66.

It is unclear how it is possible for the oxide layer to have more aluminum than the ceramic body when the oxide layer is part of the ceramic body.

In response to Applicant's argument (p. 5, para. 6 to p. 6, para. 1 of Applicant's Paper 18 June 2007) that Sonntag ('239) does not teach an amorphous matrix, it is noted that Sonntag ('239) teaches a ceramic component (col. 1, l. 7) comprising a ceramic body comprising silicon carbide (col. 1, l. 8) and an oxide layer (col. 4, ll. 38-53 and col. 2, ll. 53-57) the oxide layer containing an amorphous matrix phase comprising silica (See col. 3, ll. 25-55 wherein the amorphous matrix with "part crystalline" comprising silica, SiO₂) and a crystalline phase provided in the amorphous matrix phase (col. 3, ll. 25-49).

In response to Applicant's argument (p. 6, para. 3 to p. 7, para. 2 of Applicant's Paper 18 June 2007) that Hida ('761) does not teach the silicon carbide and alumina, it is noted that Hida ('761) teaches anisotropically-shaped crystals (col. 2, ll. 20-28), have an aspect ratio not less than about 3:1/5:1 (col. 2, ll. 22-28) and with a crystal size of about 0.2 to about 20 microns/ (0.5 to about 10 microns) (col. 2, ll. 20-28) for the purpose of providing crystals having very good strength properties (col. 2, ll. 38-43).

In response to Applicant's argument (p. 7, paras. 3-5 of Applicant's Paper 18 June 2007) that the cited references do not teach the remaining dependent claims, it is noted that Applicant has not presented any substantive argument precisely addressing any limitation in the claims.

B570
6-25-2007